



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/805,808	03/13/2001	Reiner Kraft	ARC920000147US1	6210
2512	7590	08/08/2006	EXAMINER	
PERMAN & GREEN 425 POST ROAD FAIRFIELD, CT 06824			THAI, HANH B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2163	

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/805,808

Applicant(s)

KRAFT ET AL.

Examiner

Hanh B. Thai

Art Unit

2163

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on amendment filed 6/7/06.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a Final Office Action in response to the communication received on June 7, 2006. Claims 1-31 are pending in this application.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's arguments regarding "determining an online id associated with at least one author of the document" of claims 1, 14, 20 and 22 have been considered but not found persuasive.

Lang clearly discloses the credibility rating of informon associated with author including rating an online id "A,B,C,D" associated the author, table 1 (tables1-2, col. 27, col.15, lines 1-3; col.16, lines 4-46 and col.18, lines 10-56). The "online id" generally referring to author's "a name" or "used to identify" as defined in the specification ¶[0022]. Therefore, Lang's teaching reads on the claimed "determining an online id associated with at least one author of the document."

Applicant's arguments regarding "a credibility rating system adapted to retrieve at least one credibility rating associated with the online id from a credibility rating database" of claims 1, 14, 20 and 22 have been considered but not found persuasive.

Lang clearly discloses retrieving credibility rating of authors associated with the online id (col.15, line 29 to col.16, line 46, Lang).

Applicant's arguments regarding "allow an owner of an online id to input credibility information associated with the online id" of claim 10 has been considered but not found persuasive.

Art Unit: 2163

Lang clearly discloses a user or author of an online id input credibility information associated with the online id (col. 5, lines 1-12 and 7, lines 26-35 and 46-62; col.15, lines 11-18 and col.16, lines 31-39, Lang).

Applicant's arguments regarding "a credibility database adapted to store the on-line identifier and the associated credibility rating" of claim 10 has been considered but not found persuasive.

Lang clearly discloses storing the on-line identifier and the associated credibility rating (col.12, lines 39-45 and tables1-2, col. 27 and col.22, lines 36-63, Lang).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lang et al. (U.S. Patent no. 6,314,420) of record.

Regarding claims 1, 14, 20 and 22 Lang discloses a system for associating a credibility rating with a document located in an online search comprising:

- an information gathering device (16, Fig.1, Lang) adapted to retrieve the document from an information source (11 and 13, Fig.1 col. 4, line 61 through col. 5, line 12 and col. 6, line 38 through col. 7, line 25 and lines 46-62, Lang).

Art Unit: 2163

- an information analysis device (17 and 35, Fig.1, Lang) adapted to determine an online id associated with at least one author of the document (see col.6, line 59 to col.7, line 62; col.12, lines 39-45 and tables1-2, col. 27, col.15, lines 1-3; col.16, lines 4-46 and col.18, lines 10-56, Lang discloses the credibility filtering based on the member client, community profiles including an online id “A,B,C,D” associated the author, table 1. The “online id” generally referring to author’s “a name” or “used to identify” as defined in the specification ¶[0022]); and
- a credibility rating system (400, Fig. 6, Lang) adapted to retrieve at least one credibility rating associated with the online id from a credibility rating database and provide the at least one credibility rating to associate the at least one credibility rating with the document and allow a user to access the at least one credibility rating now associated with the document (see Fig.6; col.7, lines 21-25 and lines 50-61; and col.14, lines 26-67; col.15, lines 29-60 and col. 16, lines 4-19, Lang discloses the rating applied to documents).

Regarding claim 2, Lang discloses a searchable index adapted to store an association of the credibility rating of the online id with the document, wherein the association is accessible by a search engine (see col. 11, lines 51-55, Lang).

Regarding claim 3, Lang discloses the mapping of a unique identifier associated with the document to the associated credibility rating (see col. 19, lines 9-19, Lang).

Regarding claim 4, Lang does not explicitly disclose that the web page has a unique identifier comprising a uniform resource locator, but it well known in web document. “uniform

Art Unit: 2163

resource locator” is the address of document of Lang in the “distributed network resources” (13, Fig. 1, Lang).

Regarding claim 5, Lang discloses that the online search is an Internet search and the document is retrieved from the Internet (col.7, line 8, lines 9-62; col.12, lines 39-45; col.26, lines 9-51 and tables1-2, col. 27).

Regarding claims 6, 8, 12, 21 and 23, Lang discloses “a user interface” (5,7, 9, Fig. 1, and col. 6, line 59 to col. 7, line8), “input validator” (see col. 5, lines 1-12 and 7, lines 26-35, Lang) and “...allow a third party to access the credibility rating...” (see col. 5, lines 25-35 and col. 7, lines 46-62, Lang).

Regarding claims 7 and 11, Lang discloses “determine a weight of the statement based on a statement analysis” (see col. 8, lines 9-18 and col. 15, lines 29-64, Lang).

Regarding claims 9 and 13, Lang discloses “the credibility database adapted to allow a third party to submit a query” (see col. 5, lines 36-50, Lang).

Regarding claim 10, Lang discloses a credibility rating system comprising:

- a user interface adapted to allow an owner of an online id to input credibility information associated with a document into the system for validation (5,7, 9, Fig. 1, and col. 6, line 59 to col. 7, line 8);
- an input validator coupled to the user interface in correct verify that the inputted credibility information is correct and to rate the inputted credibility information in the form of a credibility rating (see col. 5, lines 1-12 and 7, lines 26-35 and 46-62, Lang);

Art Unit: 2163

- a credibility database adapted to store the on-line identifier and the associated credibility rating (see col.6, line 59 to col.7, line 8, lines 9-62; col.12, lines 39-45 and tables 1-2, col. 27, Lang discloses the credibility filtering based on the member client, community profiles including an online id associated the author "A,B,C,D", table 1)
- An application service interface adapted to allow a third party to access the credibility rating from the credibility database (see col. Col. 5, lines 25-35 and col. 7, lines 9-62, Lang). "Community profiles" corresponds to the "credibility database".

Regarding claim 15, Lang discloses the step of determining an online id of a document comprises the step of extracting an author information code (see col. 6, lines 1-13, Turnoff). In order to parse, the information code would be extracted.

Regarding claim 16, Lang discloses the step of developing a credibility rating for an online id, the method comprising the steps of: receiving an input from the online id related to a credibility profile for the online id (11 and 13, Fig.1, Lang); validating the input by determining a weight of the input (320,330 and 345, Fig.5, and col.15, lines 37-64, Lang); assigning the credibility rating to the online id (col.15, lines 29-32, Lang); and storing the credibility rating in a searchable index (see col.12, lines 27-32, Lang).

Regarding claim 17, Lang discloses the step of integrating the credibility-rating vector into a search engine using a ranking algorithm (see col. 6, lines 23-25 and col.13, line 66 to col.14, line10, Lang).

Art Unit: 2163

Regarding claim 18, Lang discloses the step of reordering a search result list, but it is well known to rearrange the search result list because it would provide the flexibility of the searching system.

Regarding claim 19, Lang discloses the step of displaying a symbol on the information indicating the quality rating to the user (see 235, Fig.4 and col.11, line 64 to col.12, line 5, Lang).

Regarding claims 24-26, Lang discloses “credibility rating that corresponds to the subject matter of the document” (see col.6, line 59 to col.7, line 8, lines 9-62; col.12, lines 39-45 and tables1-2, col. 27, Lang).

Regarding claim 27, Lang discloses that the information gathering device and the information analysis device are located in separate domains (see Fi.1 of Lang).

Regarding claim 28, Lang discloses the credibility rating is a rating of at least one author associated with the document (see col. col. 4, line 61 to col. 5, line 12 and col. 6, line 38 to col. 7, line 25, Lang).

Regarding claim 29, Lang discloses the credibility rating database holds credibility ratings for an online ID that are categorized by subject matter (see col.3, line 49-55, Lang).

Regarding claim 30, Lang discloses the at least one credibility rating comprises a credibility information vector based on a combination of credibility ratings in at least one subject domain associated with the online ID (see col. 6, line 24-26, Lang).

Regarding claim 31, Lang discloses that the weight of the input is determined by a date input, a domain of the content, a time duration associated with the input and an action associated with the input (see col. 4, line 5-29, Lang).

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh B. Thai whose telephone number is 571-272-4029. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on 571-272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2163

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Hanh B Thai
Examiner
Art Unit 2163

July 21, 2006


DON WONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100